

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, 18, and 20 are present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 18 are independent.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 15, 16, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2003/0120742 (Ohgami) in view of U.S. Patent 6,867,688 (Lamb; newly cited). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In a Pre-Appeal Brief, an argument had been presented that the Examiner's rejection fails to consider all claimed elements. An argument had been presented that the rejection failed to address the claimed "determining means for detecting a level of the received video signal, and determining whether or not the display apparatus is in the poor signal reception state in which normal reception is not carried out." An explanation had been presented that the rejection only indicates that Cho teaches display of information pertaining to level of signal reception.

In a new ground of rejection, the Examiner has replaced the previously cited Cho reference with a newly cited reference to Lamb.

The Examiner now alleges that Lamb at col. 14, lines 27-44, teaches a display control means as recited in claim 15. The Examiner indicates that Lamb teaches the claimed feature as "where the CPU causes the displaying of a signal strength of an alert to indicate poor signal reception and to change in order to be able to display."

Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is silent with respect to the claimed "determining means for detecting a level..., and determining whether or not the display apparatus is in the poor signal reception state..."

Instead, the Examiner's rejection states "detecting means for carrying out detection of the recognition information signal," citing para. 0053-0099, 157-159 of Ohgami. However, this claim language is not recited in claim 15.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness.

In addition, Applicants submit that the section in Lamb at column 14, relied on in the Examiner's rejection, does not disclose any arrangement as recited for the display control means of claim 15. Instead, Lamb, at column 14, lines 27-44, discloses that bars 39 of a strength signal indicator 37 of a liquid crystal display 36a is displayed in accordance with a signal strength, and the word "READY" is displayed on the liquid crystal display 36a at a maximum signal strength. In other words, Lamb discloses switching from displaying bars to displaying letters.

To the contrary, the display control means as recited in claim 15 switches display formats indicative of impossibility of receiving a video signal, not in accordance with a signal strength but by use of the following two types of signals:

- 1) A signal from the determination means for detecting the level, disorder, or the like of a received video signal and determining whether or not the display apparatus is in the poor signal reception state in which normal reception is not carried out.
- 2) A signal from the recognition information signal detection means for detecting the recognition information signal of the signals received by the wireless receiving means which recognition information signal is for determining whether or not the display apparatus is identified with a wireless transmitting apparatus.

Subsequently, Applicants submit that Lamb fails to disclose the claimed feature of "display control means for outputting a signal causing the display means to display display information which indicates that it is not possible to receive a signal whose display format is changed according to the recognition information signal detected by the recognition information signal detection means." Applicants submit that Ohgami fails to make up for these deficiencies.

These arguments apply as well to claims 18 and 20, as well as dependent claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 1, 3-8, and 10-14 are allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant(s) therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant(s) believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: January 19, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222
Charles Gorenstein *Robert Downs*
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000